



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in Beneventan—L. has found over 600 of them!—but one misses a list of facsimiles. No matter how incomplete, such a list is always useful. The book is full of incidental observations of value, like that proving that the place of the famous signature of 510 A. D. in the St. Peter's Hilary MS, can only be Karalis.

The book is sumptuously printed, with lavish use of special types; there is hardly a single misprint. It seems ungracious to find any fault with such a handsome volume; but students will wish that it had been compressed and less expensively printed, and thus made available at a reasonable price. Certainly a protest (*bello peracto*!) will arise from Continental scholars; though written in what is for most of them an unfamiliar and difficult language, they will find it indispensable; and after all, the ultimate purpose of any such book is the widest advancement of science—a purpose admirably fulfilled by the *matter* of Loew's volume. It is beyond compare the most important recent paleographic investigation in any language; and it is a satisfaction to record that its author, a graduate of Cornell and Halle, has been appointed the Sanders Reader in Paleography at Cambridge, and University Lecturer in Paleography at Oxford.

C. U. CLARK.

WERNER WILHELM JAEGER, NEMESIOS VON EMESA: Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Poseidonios. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1914. Pp. xi+148.

One declares that there is nothing new under the sun; another, that history is the record of great personalities, that is to say, of men of genius and originality. There is a modicum of truth in each of these contentions. The history of human thought may be compared to the *album*: if the historian would read it aright, he must distinguish in it the *edicta tralatitia* which those who sit in judgment on the *κύκλος γενέσεως* and the *orbis terrarum* and justify the ways of God to man accept from their predecessors and transmit to their successors, but must not fail also to discern those nuances in the interpretation of the *cause célèbre* which prove that the judges were men and not machines. It is not an uncommon occurrence that the members of a court agree in their conclusion while differing radically in the course of thought which leads to it. In the so-called dark ages of the human spirit the obscurity is due to our failure to distinguish the contribution of the individual.

Where distinctions vanish the *ὄν* coincides with the *μὴ ὄν*. Until recently there was hardly a period of active and well documented human thought so dark as that of the Graeco-Roman world between 100 B. C. and 300 A. D. In their general outlines the *edicta tralatitia* were easily discerned—the inheritance of Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, and Epicurean doctrines; but the principles and prepossessions which brought about the peculiar amalgamation of these ingredients, in other words, the mental physiognomy of the man whose personality enforced the *pax Romana* in the realm of the spirit, were quite lost to view. Out of the obscurity there has gradually emerged a figure of singular interest,—Posidonius. He is taking his place in the system of *ἀρχαὶ καὶ πηγαί* which constitutes the history of Greek thought. The typical representative of the Hellenists, collecting the pure fountains springing in the highlands of the Hellenic period and in the isolated peaks of his native Orient, he gave them forth tempered and blended to irrigate the quiet gardens of the plain.

Among the number of scholars who have endeavored to recover the personality of Posidonius, perhaps none has rendered a more important service than Dr. Jaeger in his recent book, *Nemesios von Emesa: Quellenforschungen zum Neuplatonismus und seinen Anfängen bei Poseidonios*. To be sure, the indispensable thing, the thing at present most urgently demanded, still remains to be done. In the philological literature of the last quarter century there are scattered countless observations and suggestions bearing on Posidonius. These must be collected and sifted. Beginning with properly attested opinions of Posidonius and combining with them and with one another such other data as the most rigorous philological and historical method shall yield, the scholar who undertakes the difficult but fruitful task will render a service second to none. At present *Quellenforschung* in this field is in danger of ascribing everything to Posidonius. Dr. Jaeger possesses the requisite enthusiasm and can doubtless school himself to exercise the necessary critical discrimination. If he should undertake the task many, who in the present state of the inquiry hesitate to publish their suggestions, would doubtless be pleased to present them for his consideration. Dr. Jaeger's book falls into two parts. Part I. *Galens Wissenschaftslehre und der ältere Neuplatonismus*, is a notable contribution to our knowledge of the later doxographic tradition. What Diels in his *Doxographi Graeci* called the *Vetusta Placita*, and has since called the *Posidonian Placita*, is now more clearly than ever defined by the researches of Dr. Jaeger, and shown to be connected with Posidonius' commentary on the *Timaeus*. We obtain also a clearer view of a number of pagan and Christian epitomes of it, and in particular of Galen's important work,

Περὶ ἀποδείξεως. In this part there is hardly anything which the present writer would call in question. Part II. *Die Weltanschauung des Poseidonios bei Nemesios*, is not quite so satisfactory, and one cannot dispel the fear that much is credited specifically to Posidonius which was the common property of his age. Surely the tendency of Posidonius to harmonize conflicting views was not peculiar to him, but was the characteristic of his age, which was highly impressionable, but not singularly original. Much also which Dr. Jaeger takes for mystic fervor and the ecstatic vision of the Orphics is probably to be set down as nothing but rhetorical imitation of Plato τοῦ πάντα σεμνύνοντος.

Dr. Jaeger sometimes fails to see the connection of specific doctrines, which he attributes to Posidonius, with those of his predecessors. Thus when Philo (p. 111) speaks of earth being mixed with water, ἵνα ὡς ἀνὶ ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ συνέχῃται (ἡ γῆ), we must note that water is regarded by Aristotle, Hippocrates, and Empedocles as a sort of glue. Late authors interpreted the Empedoclean Φιλότης as water because of its glutinative powers, and even the figure of the δεσμός may have occurred in Empedocles. Diels' brilliant emendation yields the text δύο δέει ἄρθρον in fr. 32; and though we do not know the context of thought, it is altogether likely that Empedocles was referring either to Φιλότης or to ὕδωρ. Indeed, the Empedoclean Φιλότης is certainly the most important classical antecedent of Posidonius' theory of the δεσμός; for only when Φιλότης unites without destroying the warring elements does a κόσμος arise. Basilus clearly alluded to Empedocles in that connection. In other instances our author too hastily or with too little explanation concludes to sources, as when he declares (p. 109) that Heraclitus' harmony of the bow and the lyre was derived from the musical researches of Pythagoras. To make this obvious or probable would seem to require some explanation of παλίντροπος and τόξου.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.